



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,758	06/13/2000	TIMOTHY L. POWERS	CE03958R	5788

22917 7590 02/13/2002

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

IQBAL, KHAWAR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2685

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,758

Applicant(s)

POWERS ET AL.

Examiner

Khawar Iqbal

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glitho et al (US 6233449).

1. Regarding claim 1 Glitho et al teach a system for reducing event notifications emitted to a manager (fig. 1,3-6, abstract) comprising an agent, the agent including: a filter receiving event notifications from processes within the agent and providing filtered event notifications (col. 4, lines 55-64) an event counter module coupled to the filter for receiving the filtered event notifications from the filter (col. 4, line 65 through col.5, line11) and a performance measurement module coupled to the event counter module for receiving event counter information from the event counter module and sending alarms to the manager (col. 3, lines 15-23, col. 5, lines 12-17, col. 6, lines 59-67). However, Glitho et al do not specifically teach agent and filter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide reduces the processing since the examiner takes official notice of the equivalence of agent, filter and omcp, QoS for their use in the communication system art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to communication system would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

3. Regarding claims 2 and 3 Glitho et al teach the filter is operable to select the filtered event notifications to be sent to the event counter module, the manager establishes selection criteria upon which the filter selects the filtered event notifications (fig. 3).

4. Regarding claims 4,5 and 6 Glitho et al teach the manager requests creation of event count objects upon which the event counter module creates event count information from the filtered event notifications, the event counter module establishes threshold crossing criteria and alarm emission criteria for the performance measurement module, the performance measurement module emits an alarm to the manager if the event counter information exceeds a threshold (col. 5, lines 30-40).

2. Regarding claim 7 Glitho et al teach a method for reducing the number of event notifications sent to a manager (fig. 1,3-6, abstract) comprising filtering event notifications to provide filtered event notifications (col. 4, lines 55-64) (col. 4, line 65 through col.5, line11) counting the filtered event notifications to generate event count information from the filtered event notifications (col. 4, line 65 through col.5, line11) emitting an alarm if the event count information exceeds a threshold(col. 5, lines 12-17, col. 6, lines 59-67). However, Glitho et al do not specifically teach agent and filter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide reduces the processing since the examiner takes official notice of the equivalence of agent, filter and omcp, QoS for their use in the communication system art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to communication system would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2684

5. Regarding claim 8 Glitho et al teach to receiving the event notifications from an agent; and selecting the event notifications based on selection criteria to provide filtered event notifications (see claim 1).

6. Regarding claim 9 Glitho et al teach receiving the event notifications from an agent; and selecting the event notifications based on selection criteria to provide filtered event notifications (fig. 3-6).

7. Regarding claims 11, 12 and 13 Glitho et al teach the manager establishes criteria for selection of event notifications, the manager requests creation of event counter objects having information on thresholding and alarm notification, a group of event notifications may be selected and counted as one event (col. 7, lines 30-45).

3. Regarding claim 14 Glitho et al teach Apparatus for reducing the number of event notifications sent to a manager (fig. 1,3-6, abstract) comprising: means for filtering to provide filtered event notifications (col. 4, lines 55-64) means for counting to generate event count information from the filtered event notifications (col. 4, line 65 through col.5, line11) means for emitting alarms to the manager (col. 3, lines 15-23, col. 5, lines 12-17, col. 6, lines 59-67). However, Glitho et al do not specifically teach agent and filter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide reduces the processing since the examiner takes official notice of the equivalence of agent, filter and omcp, QoS for their use in the communication system art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to communication system would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2684

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure Kalev (# 6308071), Glitho et al (# 6233449), Feuerstein et al (6141565), Douik et al (6012152), Johansson (5946612), Durvasula et al (5870676) and Jones (# 5752164) teach reduces the processing load on the monument.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHAWAR IQBAL whose telephone number is 703-306-3015.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **URBAN EDWARD F**, can be reached at 703-305-4385.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2684 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Application/Control Number: 09/592,758

Page 6

Art Unit: 2684

Khawar Iqbal

Chauhan



2/8/02

LESTER G. KINCAID
PRIMARY EXAMINER